

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-18 and 20. Claims 1 and 15 are amended herein, and claims 6, 16-18 and 20 are cancelled herein. Claims 2 and 19 remain cancelled. No new matter is presented. Proper support for the amendments can be found at least at page 13, line 22 through page 14, line, 19 and Fig. 2 and corresponding text of the Specification as filed.

Thus, claims 1, 3-5 and 7-15 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The Examiner rejected claim 20 under § 112. As mentioned above, claim 20 is cancelled herein without prejudice.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1, 3-18 and 20 were rejected based on various combinations of the following: U.S. Patent No. 6,088,737 (Yano) and U.S. Patent No. 4,788,715 (Lee), U.S. Patent No. 5,867,572 (MacDonald), U.S. Patent No. 5,006,983 (Wayne), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0101881 (Sundaresan), U.S. Patent No. 6,023,681 (Whitt), U.S. Patent No. 6,006,269 (Phaal) and U.S. Patent No. 6,470,323 (Suzuki).

The Examiner asserts that the third embodiment of Yano discloses utilizing a waiting queue and does not specify that the user must re-sent the access request to establish communication. Col. 9, lines 36-45, which the Examiner points to, specifically states:

"Without the access state information, the user cannot determine whether the user's camera control request has been accepted by chance among many other access requests or it has been accepted because there were not many access requests; thus, the user cannot obtain a hint for the next access."

"Therefore, even for the client apparatus who is presently receiving images from the camera server apparatus, it is preferable to have means to obtain the access state information."

However, this portion of Yano discusses a user who is already connected to the camera server apparatus and is presently viewing the image sensed by the video camera and not a user whose access request has been rejected. For the above-discussed reason, the Examiner does

not appear to have established a prima facie case of obviousness. For this reason it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Moreover, the third embodiment of Yano is limited to providing access statistic information at the time of rejection of a camera control request where the permissible number of data in a waiting queue is displayed as the permissible number of accesses (see, col. 9, lines 7-15).

The Examiner relies on Lee as teaching automatically connecting a client according to a condition that the access number becomes less than or equal to the submitted number. However, Lee is limited to periodic expected waiting time announcements based on whether there are remaining number of queue entries (FIG. 6 and corresponding text and col. 6, lines 35-65).

In contrast, the present invention reduces the burden on the connection queuing server and a constant response performance is implemented.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites, "displaying an updated said information of the number of accesses being updated at a fixed time interval according to said submitted access number queried by said client on said client after displaying said information of the number of accesses." Claim 1 further recites "automatically connecting said client whose access request is suspended with said server at a time when said server becomes accessible according to a condition, which is judged by said client", where "said fixed time interval is varied according to said information of the number of accesses."

Similarly, independent claim 15 recites, "displaying an updated said information... updated at a fixed time interval according to said submitted access number queried by said client after displaying said information of the number of accesses" and "automatically connecting said client whose access request is suspended with said server when said server becomes accessible according to a condition, which is judged by said client" where the fixed time interval is "varied according to said information of the number of accesses."

Yano and Lee, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-discussed features including providing information "updated at a fixed time interval varied according to said information of the number of accesses", as recited in each of independent claims 1 and 15.

Further, MacDonald, Wayne, Sundaresan, Whitt, Phaal and/or Suzuki do not add anything to the teachings of Yano and Lee with respect to the present invention. Specifically,

none or the cited references, alone or in combination, teach that the client queries the submitted access number and the time interval for the query is set according to the number of the clients.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 5, "wherein when said server is accessible, an E-mail that indicates said server is accessible is sent to a pre-registered mail address of said user before access to said server" (see also claim 13). The cited references do not teach or suggest features recited in claims 5 and 13 including features of independent claims 1 and 15.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT:

Applicants respectfully request entry of amendments to claims because the amendments were made to clarify features recited in the claims and do not introduce significant changes that would require a further search.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 07/13/2006

By: Temnit Afework
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501